

REMARKS**I. Anticipation Rejection**

Claims 1 to 3 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as anticipated by Rembold, et al, U.S. Patent 5,878,718.

Claims 1 to 3 and 16 have been canceled, obviating their rejection as anticipated by Rembold, et al ('718).

None of new claims 17 to 41 should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as anticipated by Rembold, et al ('718) because no independent claim equivalent to canceled claim 1 has been added and is currently pending. All of the independent claims 17, 24 and 35 only include allowable subject matter according to page 3 of the Office Action.

II. Obviousness Rejection

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Rembold ('718) in view of Rosenau.

Claim 7 has been canceled, obviating its rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Rembold ('718) in view of Rosenau.

None of new claims 17 to 41 should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Rembold, et al ('718) in view of Rosenau, because no independent claim containing the subject matter of canceled claims 1 and 7 has been added and is currently pending. All of the independent claims 17, 24 and 35 only include allowable subject matter according to page 3 of the Office Action.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 8 and 14 to 15 were only objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

New claims 17 to 41 have been filed and the original claims 1 to 16 including the claims withdrawn from consideration have been canceled without prejudice.

New claims 17 to 41 include three independent claims, namely claims 17, 24 and 35.

New claim 17 includes the features and limitations of canceled claim 6 and canceled claim 1, the only claim that claim 6 depended on. Thus new claim 17 should be allowed according to page 3 of the Office Action. It should also be noted that claim 17 is generic for the embodiments shown in all figures, except for the embodiment of figure 2.

New claim 24 includes the features and limitations of canceled claim 8 and canceled claim 1, the only claim that claim 8 depended on. Thus new claim 24 should also be allowed according to page 3 of the Office Action. Apparently claim 24 is generic for all embodiments shown in all the figures, provided the last paragraph of claim 24 is interpreted broadly as allowing other connecting elements, such as check valve 12b.

New claim 35 includes the features and limitations of canceled claim 14 and canceled claim 1, the only claim that claim 14 depended on. Thus new claim 35 should also be allowed. Claim 35 is generic for only the embodiments of

figures 9 to 12.

New dependent claim 36 includes the features of dependent claim 15 and depends on claim 35 and thus should also be allowed, in accordance with the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action.

IV. New Dependent Claims

An appropriate set of new dependent claims has been provided above for each of the new independent claims 17, 24 and 35. A reasonable number of species of invention may be claimed in the same application, provided that they are claimed with dependent claims depending on an allowed generic claim. As noted above it appears that claim 24 is generic for all species shown in the figures and claim 17 appears to be generic for all species, except for the species of figure 2.

Five dependent claims including the subject matter of canceled claims 2, 3, 7, 12 and 16 have been added depending on each independent claim 17, 24 and 35. New dependent claims 18, 25 and 37 each include the subject matter of canceled claim 2. New dependent claims 19, 26 and 38 each include the subject matter of canceled claim 3. New dependent claims 20, 27 and 39 include the features and limitations of canceled claim 12. New dependent claims 21, 30 and 40 include the features of canceled claim 7. New dependent claims 22, 28 and 41 include the features of canceled claim 16.

New dependent claims 23 and 29 include the features and limitations of canceled claim 4.

Canceled claims 9 to 11 and 13 depended on the allowed claim 8. New claim 24 contains the subject matter of claims 1 and 8. Thus claim 8 is a linking claim for the subject matter of claims 9 to 11 and 13. New dependent claims 31 to 34 contain the subject matter of claims 9, 10, 11 and 13 respectively and thus should be allowed together with new claim 24, in accordance with the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action (because claims 9 to 11 and 13 depended on allowed claim 8).

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawing be further amended or corrected in formal respects to put this case in condition for final allowance, then it is requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing the case to allowance, he or she is invited to telephone the undersigned at 1-631-549 4700.

In view of the foregoing, favorable allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker,
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 27,233